

62
thru 5

Equal Rights

VOL. XIV, No. 5
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY,
MARCH 10, 1928



Cuban Women Honor Woman's Party Envoys

The Pupils, Faculty, and Principals of the Colegio Sanchez y Tiant of Havana, Cuba, present flowers to Jane Norman Smith, Chairman of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, and to Doris Stevens, Chairman of the Committee on International Action, in token of their appreciation of the work of the National Woman's Party. From left to right, Angelica F. Trevejo, Doris Stevens, Aurora Feo, Jane Norman Smith, and Carmen Martinez.

Feminist Notes

\$3,000 Good Pay for Women

A WOMAN with a salary of over \$3,000 a year belongs to the exceptional minority, Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse of the United States Bureau of Economics told the National Education Association in reporting the results of a salary survey of over 3,000 single women with full-time jobs.

"As one might expect, by far the greater number, 2,321 to be exact, were in educational work, and 718 in all other fields," Mrs. Woodhouse said. Of those in educational work, 194 were in administrative work and 2,127 teaching.

"The best paid women in this group were the three college presidents with an average salary of \$8,200. Next came the nine principals of junior high schools with an average salary of \$3,859, four normal school principals with \$3,800, and fifty-two college deans with \$3,426. In teaching the highest average salary was \$2,457 for the colleges, and the lowest \$1,632 for the grade schools.

"Apart from educational work, fifty-two occupations were reported. The best paid woman was an executive in a commercial organization. She made \$34,000 a year besides dividends on her stock. I think she illustrates a practice which we ought to encourage; that is, to enter the family business. This step, so usual for men, is quite exceptional for women.

"The usual assumption that business pays better than the professions is not true of this group. The managers of cafeterias and tearooms averaged \$3,300, and interior decorators \$3,146; but all other women in business averaged less than \$3,000. In the professional groups statisticians averaged \$3,750, lawyers \$4,587, physicians \$3,551, research workers \$3,271.

"Is a higher degree an economic asset? To a librarian an M.A. is worth on the average \$193 a year, and a Ph.D. \$600. This is good interest on the investment."

Airwoman Lands Safely Despite Sunstroke

LADY HEATH, formerly Mrs. Elliott-Lynn, was obliged to make a forced landing in a flight in South Africa on February 25 because she had a sunstroke. When she realized what was happening, she shut off her engine, guided the machine to the only possible landing place in the vicinity, and knew no more until she awoke in a native hut with the occupants giving her drink, according to a New York Times wireless.

Jugoslav Moslems Abolishing Veil

REIS-UL-ULEMA and the Great Mufti, two Moslem church dignitaries in Jugo-Slavia, have advocated the abolition of the veil and the fez, and Moslem women have arisen to express their approval and gratitude.

A declaration appeared recently in the daily *Politika* by Nafija Baljak, a teacher and the secretary of the Moslem Educational Women's Association, "Osvitanje," in which she said, "We Moslem women are most grateful to Reis-ul-Ulema (who advocates emancipation from the old customs) and stand by him, when as our chief religious representative he gives us the right to uncover our faces."

Passing of a Woman's Institution

COMMENTING upon the closing of the New York Infirmary for Women and Children, the *Nation* (New York) in its issue of March 7 says editorially:

"The day will come when discriminations against women will have vanished and special institutions for women will close their doors. But that day is not here. In the thirteen leading hospitals of New York City, public and private, only eleven women doctors hold staff positions. Women medical graduates are accepted as internes—although hardly on equal terms with men—but are shut out from later hospital experience. The only hospital to open its doors freely to women doctors is the New York Infirmary for Women and Children, founded in 1853 by Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, and since then run and staffed entirely by women. The need for such a hospital was, of course, more acute in her day—when women doctors were insulted and denounced and when women medical students were subjected to ridicule and physical violence by their men colleagues. But if the position of women doctors is better, they face a difficulty more serious, perhaps, than the barrage of rotten tomatoes that showered their sisters of the last generation. They face the apathy of a world that assumes too lightly that women have won the fight against inequality and professional ostracism. The trustees of the Women's Infirmary have announced that its doors will close on July 1; that the need for a hospital staffed by women is no longer serious enough to warrant the expense of maintaining it. The entire staff of the hospital and the Women's Medical Association have protested this decision. If it stands, a great loss will be suffered by the women of the country, and through them by the whole community."

Women Dominate Parliament Opening

WOMEN demanding the franchise on equal terms with men dominated the opening of the British Parliament on February 7, according to press reports received in this country.

The *Associated Press* reported the women's activities as follows:

"Militant suffragists' tactics, which were supposed to have gone out of fashion over a decade ago, provided lively competition for public interest to the scenes at Westminster where the King, with his crown and robes of state, drove to the Parliament buildings in a coach of glass and gold to read his speech from the throne.

"Almost the first word of the Government in the reopening of Parliament was a promise that the voting age of women would be lowered to 21, on the same basis as men, before the next general election. This means that, barring some unforeseen happening, there will be no general election before the spring of next year, for if the bill passes this session it will require several months to register the new voters and go through with other necessary formalities.

"There was more activity outside of Parliament. Early in the morning 'flapper suffragists,' as they are known here, furnished some unexpected excitement. Four members of the young suffragists—Misses Dorothy Woodman, secretary; Helen Fletcher, Prudence Coutts-Trotter, and Gouden Bach—all of them young women of good standing, appeared at the gates of Buckingham Palace with the intention of offering King George a petition signed by influential persons in favor of hastening passage of the new suffrage bill.

"The young women were frustrated by police, but adopted an old-time ruse which nearly took Miss Coutts-Trotter to the privy house door of the palace. She was caught, however, by a nimble policeman despite her wild dodging. She was carried kicking and struggling across the court yard, where she was pressed outside the gate. The young suffragists then abandoned further attempts to give the petition to the King.

"A copy of the petition previously had been left without difficulty at 10 Downing street for the Prime Minister."

Favors Women Preachers

RECOMMENDATIONS that women have a place in the Ministry of the United Church in Canada are contained in the report of a special committee of preachers and laymen which will be submitted to the General Council of the Church.

Michigan Branch Welcomes Ruth Elder

MARGARET WHITEMORE, a member of the National Council of the Woman's Party sends the following interesting account of the reception given to Ruth Elder by the Michigan Branch of the Woman's Party in Detroit.

"Mrs. Bessie Moton Garner, chairman of the Detroit Branch of the Woman's Party went in an aeroplane to Chicago to meet Ruth Elder on Friday, February 10. About thirty of our members gathered at the Ford airport to meet them when they returned from Chicago. They were to arrive at about three o'clock in the afternoon. Mr. Ford and many of the most distinguished flyers, including George Haldeman, were there. Our big reception committee of women was laden with flowers in purple, white and gold sent by our good and faithful member Mrs. Visser. At about three o'clock when the weather was very stormy and snowy, scouting planes started out to meet them. We had a telephone message that the plane carrying Miss Elder and Mrs. Garner had left Chicago at noon. The scouts came back and reported no trace of them. Then Haldeman and a party started out and went half way across Michigan, but there was not a sign of them. We got in touch with all of the signal stations across the State. The plane had not been seen or signaled since it had left, crossing Lake Michigan in a snow storm. Eddie Stinson, the greatest pilot we have, was piloting his own plane in which they were riding.

"It started to get very dark. By eight o'clock we were thoroughly alarmed. I telephoned the papers (and incidentally through telephoning got out extras every few minutes) that the plane was lost, and it was. About nine o'clock we heard that they were safe, way down in Southern

Indiana. They had struck a storm immediately after leaving Chicago and had to rise to eight thousand feet to get above it and for hours cruised around trying to find a break in the storm so as to land. Every time they attempted to drop, so much ice formed on the wings that the weight made it very dangerous so they had to rise again. They were over Detroit at three o'clock but could not see. When they finally found a hole in the clouds they had gasoline to last only fifteen minutes longer. They had no idea as to where they were. This is reported to be the first official delegation of women to meet anyone by airplane. Mrs. Garner was perfectly poised through it all.

"Monday evening, February 13, we had a party at the theatre at which Ruth Elder appeared. Mrs. Garner spoke at the first performance and Mrs. Arthur Cramer at the second. We reached more than six thousand people in that way. First they spoke on the principles of the Woman's Party and then our reason for honoring Ruth Elder and then they introduced Miss Elder as a member of the Woman's Party. She said that she was proud to be a member of the Woman's Party. She was very charming and she spent the entire evening on the mezzanine with us when she was not speaking. All of our party met her.

"On Friday the seventeenth we had a lovely luncheon, or rather we called it a breakfast at noon, out at the Fox and Hounds Inn in Bloomfield Hills. There were fifty guests. Mrs. William A. McGraw, our State chairman, presided, introducing her daughter Kathleen McGraw Hendrie. Mrs. Hendrie introduced Mrs. Garner who spoke splendidly on the need of having the courage to live and

think and believe Equal Rights all of the time. Then she paid a fine tribute to Ruth Elder who looked simply charming.

"Miss Elder spoke very simply and sincerely about her interest in our work and told how the Woman's Party had welcomed her everywhere. She said she felt very much at home as soon as she was in a group of Woman's Party women. She told of the lovely luncheon given by the party members for her in San Francisco and of the efforts of the San Diego Branch to do the same thing, but through some misunderstanding on the part of local managers it was prevented. When her manager, Mr. Rickenback, heard of this he notified the local manager wherever she went to have Ruth Elder available to the National Woman's Party any time and any where that it was possible. He said that he had never dealt with a finer group of women in his life and he personally was very appreciative of all we had done to honor Miss Elder. He also told Mrs. Garner the same thing in Chicago.

"A group of Woman's Party members in Chicago led by Mary Caroline Taylor, chairman of the Illinois Branch, met Mrs. Garner and Ruth Elder in Chicago at the Blackstone and sped them on their way after expressing to Miss Elder what she means to us as a brave young woman daring to break a way for women in a new field."

Miss Whittemore also stated that she had secured a new influential member in Italy, Mrs. Grace F. Leggett (Mrs. John), Villa Poggiochiario, Castillo, presso Florence, Italy. Mrs. Leggett expects to help in the work in Europe where she has a large group of interesting friends, including Queen Marie of Roumania.

Mrs. Hendrie's Speech at Ruth Elder Breakfast

Friends and Members of the
National Woman's Party:

This week has given us great cause for rejoicing and has rekindled our enthusiasm both internationally and locally. The news from Havana as you've probably read not only in Equal Rights but in our own newspapers is so inspiring; the description of that beautiful parade of over two hundred Cuban women and our little band of North American women brought vividly to my mind again the wonderful procession to our Capital that my mother, the present chairman of the Michigan Branch and I were privileged to march in. Bearing a monster petition from the enfranchised women of the West, the first time their votes had been used to help the women in these more benighted East-

ern States. Doris Stevens, all in white with the purple, white, and gold, was the beautiful marshal of the day. Now she is in Havana at the head of the delegation from National Headquarters, and leading under those same banners a most significant procession. The first time Cuban women have ever marched for Equal Rights. From the success attending their conferences with leaders in international law, it may even come about that we have international recognition before we have national. This delegation to the Sixth Pan-American Conference has surely blazed a trail with far-reaching results.

Locally you know with what enthusiasm we have welcomed Ruth Elder. As Margaret Whittemore, our national vice-chairman, said when we were planning this luncheon, "Ruth Elder does not have to

talk about Equal Rights—she just lives them. She took that marvelous trip not as a woman aviator, but as an aviator. She has done the thing that helps us most—broken down barriers by doing things. She is a symbol of this age of youth, just taking this equality for granted, and so helping to bring it! This is what the Woman's Party everywhere has felt about Ruth Elder. There has been this spontaneous recognition all over the country of what she has done for us. So we have claimed her."

Our appreciation has been most genuine. Our admiration and affection for our own Detroit aviator—Bess Garner—who took our greetings by aeroplane over to Chicago makes us want to hear from her, and as she has been so brave we want to have her introduce Miss Elder.

Equal Rights



OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Lincoln 1366
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker Editor
Dora G. Ogle Business Manager

Associate Editors:

Nina E. Allender	Ines Haynes Irwin
Zoe Beckley	Ada Davenport Kendall
Ruby A. Black	Katherine Leckie
Elaine Sterne Carrington	Hazel MacKay
Lucia Chamberlain	Edna St. Vincent Millay
Phyllis Duganne	Ruth Pickering
Crystal Eastman	Alice Robe
Ernestine Evans	Maryse Rutledge
Rose Feld	Miriam Finn Scott
Zona Gale	Doris Stevens
Helen Davenport Gibbons	Sophie Treadwell
Rebecca Hourwich	Brenda Ueland
Ruth Hale	Sue S. White

Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,
Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, \$2.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, \$2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

President, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Chairman National Council, Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
Advisory Chairman, Alice Paul, N. J.
Vice-Chairmen,
Gail Laughlin, Me.
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Secretary, Evelyn Wainwright, D. C.
Executive Secretary, Mabel Vernon, Del.
Treasurer, Emma Wold, Ore.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Calif.
Legislative Secretary, Emma Wold, Ore.
Parliamentarian, Emma C. Fox, Mich.
Edith Ainge, N. Y.
Anne Archbold, Me.
Laura Berrien, D. C.
Florence B. Boeckel, D. C.
Mrs. John W. Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Isaac H. Dixon, Md.
Zona Gale, Wis.
Margaret Lambie, D. C.
Ines Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Cal.
Mrs. John C. Martin, Pa.
Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.
Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Sarah Pell, N. Y.
Dr. Caroline E. Spencer, Colo.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mabel Vernon, Del.
Evelyn Wainwright, D. C.
Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Mrs. Harvey Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues.....	\$10.00
Associate Members.....	\$1.00
Subscribing Members.....	\$3.00
Founders	\$100.00
Life Members.....	\$1,000.00
Endowers	\$5,000.00
Sustainers	\$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 64.]

Introduced in the Senate, January 4, 1928,
by SENATOR CHARLES E. CURTIS.

The New Physiology

"WOMEN, provided they have equal living facilities and recreational opportunities, are just as healthy as men, in the opinion of Dr. Rosalie Morton of New York. In tests made in several department stores she discovered that the percentage of men and women who require medical attention in the rest rooms is about equal. Women who have as good salaries as men and who can afford as good food and as airy living quarters are just as healthy. The underdeveloped girls who receive poorer wages, however, are not as healthy. Dr. Morton's theory is contrary to that held by many employers. In justice to the woman worker it should be given wide publicity."

A casual reader, unobservant of the quotes, might suppose that the preceding lines flowed directly from our pen so feminist an attitude toward physiology and economics is disclosed therein. Not so, however. The lines quoted appeared originally on February 28 in the editorial column of the *Washington Post*.

Now all the world knows that the *Washington Post* is not primarily a Feminist paper. Its object is to disseminate news, not feminism. Hence it may be assumed that no bias influenced the editorial pen.

We emphasize this point because it is occasionally charged that Feminists twist the hard facts of physiology to their own purposes.

Womanhood has so long been regarded as a congenital disease that anyone maintaining that women were even approximately as healthy as men would until recently have been considered as more or less of a fanatic. Yet here we have it as bona fide news that women are *just* as healthy as men, provided their living standards are equal.

For a long time we have insisted that one of the principle obstacles to Equal Rights was the old physiology which presented women with "costal breathing," and with a sort of diseased functionalism.

It is a great comfort nowadays to see the new physiology coming into vogue, with its concept of woman as a healthy human being. Hats off, we say, to the women doctors who do not confuse normal function with insidious disease!

Blame the Woman

WE find ourselves greatly amused by the remarks attributed by the press to Senator Reed Smoot anent the Senate inquiry into unemployment. "Just look at what is happening to cotton," Senator Smoot is reported to have said. "You can see that all the women are wearing silk. As far as dresses go today they are all silk. Three and a half yards it takes to make a dress, and it's got to be all silk." Thus, says the press, the learned Senator "attributes all the unemployment trouble to the women."

At all events we are relieved that Senator Smoot did not follow the usual precedent and single out one class of women, the married women, to blame for taking the jobs away from men, thereby, oh, curious thought, occasioning unemployment. He blames the women, all women, for wearing silk and, the inference is, so little of it. Three and a half yards, forsooth, when they might cart around ten or twelve yards, or even a bale of cotton.

But we should like to remind the worthy Senator that women, especially when wearing silk, dress not exclusively for their own erudition. Masculine as well as feminine taste is involved, so we insist men should be held equally responsible with women.

We are confident that if Senator Smoot can alter the taste of men so that they will prefer yards and yards of cotton swathed about their dancing partners, the miserly three and a half yards of silk will capitulate to a great boom in the cotton industry.

So it's up to the gentlemen after all. And when it comes right down to the point every laundress knows that men themselves don't trot around any too much cotton.

In Behalf of the Equal Rights Treaty

HONORABLE DELEGATES:

WE are met together on a great historic occasion. This is the first time in the history of the world that women are come before an international body to plead for treaty action on their rights.

We are met in this beautiful hall already consecrated to new ideals of Pan-Americanism. I ask you to look well at the moving tapestries which hang on these walls. Twenty-one medallions represent the twenty-one republics assembled here today. What is the artist's conception of each republic? It is a very simple concept. The splendid figures of two human beings: Man and Woman. The artist is right. That, in the last analysis, is all there is to a State: Man and Woman!

Behind us is another moving concept of the artist. Where a crown once symbolized autocratic authority, you now have substituted a golden Western Hemisphere ablaze with light. The torch of freedom lights the golden replica of this hemisphere.

We could not, if we had searched far and wide, have found more beautiful and appropriate symbols to the subject matter on which we address you today. These are the symbols of a new world, of a new hemisphere—with new ideals as to that most important of all human relationships; the relationship between man and woman. Humanly stated, our thesis today is Man and Woman; the ultimate power in the world.

You have it in your power to make these symbols come alive. You can, here and now, if you will, take decisive action toward making men and women equal before the law in this hemisphere. We are in the hands of a friendly body. You have already declared unanimously your belief that men and women should be equal before the law. Today we propose a method of obtaining that equality.

Great laws are born of deep convictions. They are not made by technicians.

It is our deep convictions that we bring you today. But that is not all we bring you. We stand ready to work with you, as eminent jurists, through your appointed commission, to hasten the procedure of our proposal. For we do not come before you unprepared. We have studied carefully the merits of our proposal. And since with rare exception men cannot feel as we do, the sting of belonging to a group which is classed as inferior, we ask to be allowed authoritative power—not as auxiliaries but as colleagues—to consult between this confer-

Address Made by Doris Stevens, Chairman of the Committee on International Action of the National Woman's Party (U. S. A.), Before the Unofficial Plenary Session of the Sixth Pan-American Conference,

Havana, Cuba, February 7, 1928

ence and the next with the sub-commission assigned to study the abolition of the present discriminations against women or until that legal subjection of women is

Address of Presentation

Delivered on the Occasion of a Demonstration in Honor of the Woman's Party Envoys to the Pan-American Conference in Havana, Cuba, January 26, 1928.

Mrs. Smith and Miss Stevens:

Dear Ladies—The pupils, faculty, and principals of the "Colegio Sanchez y Tiant" are willing to make a public demonstration that they join you in the noble ideals which you represent asking equal civil and political rights for both men and women in America, and so we come to give, together with our cordial greetings, these bouquets which, as we wish, may represent our sympathy for you personally, and for the cause you sustain; and for which are our best wishes for success, as that success will enlarge the actual human horizons and will make for a joyous collaboration of men and women to make life happier, and help to enjoy the glory of a better world, a world which we wish to be better and better every day in the long run of time.

May these flowers be an expressive message from us all! So we cordially wish!

AURORA FEO,
ANGELICA F. TREVEJO,
CARMEN MARTINEZ.

Havana, Cuba.

abolished in the Americas. We shall not fold our standards until this subjection is removed. You might better act wisely and justly immediately on what you will only have eventually to do.

Since the beginning of time, men with the best of intentions, no doubt, have been writing laws for our good. Since the beginning of time, brave and valiant women have been abolishing these same laws written for our good.

There is no limit to what man wishes to do for our good. Last week press

dispatches from the United States carried the news that a husband and father had killed his wife, the mother of his children, and the children. When questioned as to his motives, he replied that he did it for their good!

The Associated Press dispatch reported from a seaport in Algeria last week also, another example of man's desire to protect woman for her good. For the Mohammedan women's good, custom does not permit them to bathe at the same time as men. Five women were drowned when the bathhouse collapsed, while men were getting up their courage to break the man-made custom and enter the building reserved that day for women bathers.

This, in the realm of custom, is the logical if absurd outcome of the iniquity of one code of conduct for women and another for men.

Is it any wonder that enlightened women are in revolt today against acts done for their good? We want no more laws written for our good and without our consent. We must have the right to direct our own destiny jointly with you.

For, you see, no man, no group of men, no government, no nation, no group of nations—ever had the right to withhold from us the rights we ask today. We ask to have restored rights which have been usurped. These are our human rights.

From the year 1846, when the code of Estevan de Ferrater of Barcelona was proposed to the year 1928, eminent men from all corners of the earth have drafted and proposed codes of international law embracing among many subjects, articles relating to the status of women. They have, however, been pre-eminently codes for men. A study of these codes shows at first a few articles concerning the status of women appearing. Each proposed article on the status of women reflects the then existing backward social position she held. More and more points on the status of women, it is true, have been included in these codes through the intervening years, although no code has been proposed giving women equality with men. Are we to permit to grow this vast net work of one code for men with special articles inserted for women? If there were no free choice, it is conceivable that in two hundred years we might see our book-shelves staggering under the weight of a double stock of law books, heavy with special codes for women and special codes for men. It is even conceivable that in two hundred years a point would be reached where the codes for men and the

codes for women might become identical. But we are not condemned to take any risk. We can exercise free choice. We can stop this method of codification and begin to write now international law for all human beings irrespective of sex.

Another danger which attends waiting upon evolution, lies in the fact that there is no marked tendency to take the most advanced law regarding women on each point. Though eminent jurists advocate and propose what they call "progressive codification," it is not found to be so for women. The most distinguished jurists agree that codification should be a rehabilitation of law, and even a creation of new laws when public opinion demands it.

Furthermore, when public opinion demands it, newer and speedier methods are taken to reach a goal.

We have chosen the road we propose to travel. That right at least cannot be denied us today.

IT is fitting that the American continent should be the first union of republics to be asked for an Equal Rights treaty. The demand for women's rights was born on this continent. Abigail Adams was, so far as we know, the first woman in modern history to write to her husband, John Adams, when the United States Constitution was being formed after our war of independence: "While you are writing this new constitution, I pray you, do not forget the ladies. If you do, we shall foment a hot rebellion." Again, it was in 1848 in the United States of America that our great pioneers called a congress and wrote a stirring declaration of our rights. This agitation continued until our Civil War in 1861. Again, the women demanded their rights at the same time that they demanded freedom for the black slaves. The slaves were freed. The women were not. It was not until 1919 that the political rights of women were written into our Constitution.

It is not in our traditions to be content with what we have gained. It is not in our traditions to be laggards of liberty. The impulse to gather together our power and push on more rapidly is strong in us.

We have chosen the treaty method because it is the most dignified. It is the easiest. It is the most permanent. It will not only abolish existing national and international inequalities. It will prevent new ones from being written. And lastly, it obviates a cruel waste of energy. For we ought never be compelled to appeal for our rights to the most backward opinion in any State. Our appeal to the most select, the most cultivated, the most imaginative men in the world, should be welcomed, approved and answered in this most dignified method.

Some will tell us that rights of women lie exclusively in the domain of domestic

law. This is purely a matter of opinion.

The extension of what was formerly considered purely domestic law into the domain of international law has been the most distinctive feature of legal history in the last quarter of a century. There is every reason to believe that international action will expand to embrace more and more all the acts of humankind. Global action may come in the future. Our proposal lies in the current of our time. You may delay it. You cannot stop it. We want to accelerate it.

Timid souls may say this has never been done. That answer does not move us. All compelling history of the world has been made by those who dared to establish great precedents, who ventured in unknown paths, who led the way. The men who follow are never remembered—it is those who lead, who direct the current of civilization.

There will be those who say: "Woman's rights are not a fit subject for treaty action." To this we answer: "Discriminations against women have already been made the subject of action by convention by certain of the Americas and amongst European nations through the League of Nations. If discriminations against us as women on the sole ground of sex can be made the subject of international conventions, so can our rights."

LET us examine the treaty-making power of my own country. The treaty-making power of the United States is granted in the Constitution without any express limitation as to the subject matter of the treaty. Limitations on the subject matter are only implied. They are undefined and not judicially determined. Since no treaty has ever been held unconstitutional by any court in the United States—Federal or State—it cannot be given as more than a matter of opinion (not law) that the subject matter of our treaty would be so held. Everything written on the point of what is and what is not fit subject for treaty action—and there has been a mass of opinion—is purely academic. It is *obiter dicta*. The best thought is that restraints on the treaty-making power ought to exist only in the concrete—not in the abstract.

Charles Henry Butler goes so far as to say that "it is still an undecided question whether the judicial department of the court has the power either to declare void a treaty made and ratified according to constitutional method, or to declare that the executive and legislative departments of the Government exceeded the power vested in them by the people." (See Charles Henry Butler "The Treaty-Making Power of the United States," Vol. II, pp. 351-363. Also Woolsey "International Law," item 103, p. 160, 6 ed.; also Ware V. Hylton—U. S. Sup. Court, 1796, 3 Dall. 199.)

REGARDING the supremacy of a treaty over a conflicting State law, eminent jurists disagree. Time permitting, we could cite you opinions on each side of this controversy with the balance of modern opinion, perhaps, on the side of the supremacy of the National Government. "The very words of our Constitution imply that some treaties will be made in contravention of the laws of the State, whether the legislative authority under which they are passed is concurrent with that of Congress, or exclusive of that of Congress," says that eminent jurist Elihu Root (address made by Elihu Root at first annual meeting of the American Society of International Law. * * * * * American Journal International Law, Vol. I, pp. 278-283, April, 1907).

Finally, your distinguished member, His Excellency Orestes Ferrara, said in his report on "Treaties" to the Commission on Public International Law last week—in reference to the code of Public International Law, drawn up by the Conference of Jurists at Rio de Janeiro, April, 1927:

"In not a single clause has limitation as to the content of treaties been defined. * * * The will of contracting parties (to a treaty) has been left in complete and absolute liberty."

WE therefore offer you a treaty which we believe the United States Government and other governments of Pan-America are fully empowered to enter into. Legal interpretations may offer barriers. The United States Constitution states none.

Men may differ as to their willingness to accept the rights of women as proper subject matter for treaty action. To persuade them to our point of view is the task we have undertaken.

We can only touch upon these points here.

We shall hope to discuss them exhaustively with the commission appointed to study Equal Rights for women.

Our proposed method of establishing Equal Rights is not as revolutionary as you might think—revolutionary in thought perhaps, but not international procedure.

At the first conference of the International Labor Office of the League of Nations, (Washington, 1919), three out of seven conventions were written for women-workers on the ground of sex. The second conference (Genoa, 1920) wrote conventions applying to both sexes (adults and children). At the third conference (Geneva, 1921) more conventions were written for both sexes among adults and children. In 1927 (Geneva) the same

office wrote conventions on sickness insurance for workers of both sexes.

These are but a few of many examples which prove two things. Jurists have written conventions making women unequal before international law. Jurists have written conventions making men and women equal before international law. There is no fixed policy—except as there is the general evasion of accepting the idea of laws for human beings. Some of the conventions are for women and children of one sex. Some are for women and children of both sexes. Some are for men and women. The result is not only an appalling hodge-podge. It is manifestly stupid and unfair to both adults and children.

How much simpler it would be to take our clear and decisive method! The result would be one body of conventions for adult men and women, and another for children of both sexes. There could then be a house cleaning of all the useless conventions based on the arbitrary factor of sex.

CONVENTIONS have been proposed and ratified regulating the hours of work of women, regulating the time of day when women shall work—as was done by the convention of the International Conference at Berne in 1906—as was done by the Convention for the Unification of Protective Laws for Workmen and Laborers, signed February 7, 1923, by Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica. For example, Article I of this convention signed by the five Central American countries, stipulates the time of day wherein women shall be permitted to work. Will you tell us this can be done and at the same time tell us that a treaty shall not be negotiated enabling adult women to choose their own times of work and their own occupations, which our treaty would enable them to do?

Again, will you tell us that the League of Nations (1921 Convention for Prevention of Traffic in Women and Children) can propose a convention for the suppression of the traffic in women, which convention is to date signed by more than thirty-five countries in the world—and in the same breath tell us that a treaty cannot be negotiated for other women? Must we become sex-slaves before we can be judged fit subjects for action by convention? International action was not taken on this shameful traffic primarily because women are sold and transported from one country to another. You know as well as we do that that international convention was written because the moral conscience of the world demanded it.

May I say in passing that it is our firm belief that if women were not held in contempt before the law, were not held socially inferior and cheap in the eyes of society, this traffic would never exist.

Unconventionally yes, but not traffic in women. It is our firm belief that so swiftly as you make us your equals, so swiftly will your international conventions written on this subject fall into disuse because they will not be necessary.

We find, then, that international conventions are in operation affecting the following groups of women:

1. Women who work by day.
2. Women who work by night.
3. Women who are trafficked in.
4. Women before and after childbirth.
5. Women who are ill.
- And proposed for.
6. Women who marry aliens.

Is it not folly to continue on this piecemeal path? Leave aside for a moment the justice of our claim. Leave aside all legal procedure, which is not always synonymous with common sense. Does not plain, homely common-sense compel you to embrace by treaty action now, the rights of all women and scrap all this idiotic segregation of women in conventions? Does not wisdom call to you to save yourselves and ourselves from further bulky, cumbersome, unjust international action? We hope they do.

Some of the delegates have advised us not to propose an Equal Rights treaty at this time. "This treaty will call up legal and juridical difficulties, and you will be defeated." Our answer to this is, gentlemen, if you find our proposal difficult, that is your misfortune. If statesmen avoid all questions because they are difficult, nothing vital will ever be accomplished. The first requisite is to agree on the broad, general principle of equality between men and women set forth in the proposed treaty, and if your heart is in that agreement, your intelligence will settle the technical difficulties. On the point of defeat, this must be said: a defeat of the treaty will be your defeat—not ours.

THERE is another point we would like to call to your attention. Since working with this conference we have heard the opinion expressed—I regret to say—by one of our compatriots, that Equal Rights may be all right for the women of North America, but that the women of Latin America are not yet ready for them. We women resent and disbelieve in any hint of sectional superiority. It may be that there is a hope implied that, although we women of North America may be out of hand, the women of Latin America may still be kept under legal subjection. We do not believe that the men of North America are called upon to be tender protectors of the women of Latin America.

We do not look with approval upon this attempt to divide women. Our subjection is world-wide. The abolition of our subjection will be accomplished by world-

wide solidarity of women. Furthermore, we have not noticed that the men of the Northern and the Southern Americas are reluctant to unite in Pan-Americanism because there may exist different customs, differing attitudes of mind toward your mutual problems. The unwarranted presumption is again: one code of conduct for women, another for men.

We bear witness today before you to the growing solidarity among the women of the Americas.

This conference will long be remembered by what it does here for the women of the Americas. Nothing you gentlemen will do during this conference will be of such far-reaching importance as the action you will take toward the liberty of women. Nothing will so distinguish you for all time as to abandon at once all separate codes of law for men and women and to substitute in their place the great principle making women equal with men before the law.

We want to be your peers, your comrades, your helpmates, your partners in the great adventure of life. These we shall be in a properly civilized society. You can hasten that day.

SO long as inequality before the law exists between men and women, less is expected of women by men. Less is expected by women of themselves. This in turn affects our whole body of opinion, our whole culture. Less courage, less balance in judgment, a lower standard of public spirit, an indifference in international co-operation. This is the reward of inequality. This is a menace to men as well as to women. To expect less is to receive less. We stand ready to give all of our abilities to society, not our limited, restricted abilities. Do you want less?

Will you welcome the opportunity, or will you hesitate? Will you condemn us further to the ignoble, unworthy, unlovely procedure of begging every laggard in our hemisphere to concur before action is taken, or will you men whom we choose to call our intellectual equals release us by your acts?

We ask for immediate recommendation by the conference of the proposed Equal Rights treaty, a tentative draft of which we now present to you. This treaty was drawn up by Alice Paul, of the United States, beloved Feminist leader and distinguished scholar of international law.

We have told you what we want. The rest is up to you. Who will be the first country to dare to trust its women with that degree of equality which will come through the negotiation of the treaty? Which country among you will claim this honor?

Pan-Americanism will move a swifter, lovelier, more rhythmic pace, if men and women run together.

News from the Field

Recent Events in Maryland

THE month of February, the shortest of the year, has been full of pleasurable activities for the Maryland Branch—a card party, a dinner, and the usual weekly teas.

Colonel Amos W. W. Woodcock, United States District Attorney, was the speaker for the tea held on February 7, his theme being "Poetry and Politics," which he handled most expertly and entertainingly. Mrs. Dora G. Ogle was the hostess.

The following Tuesday Olive W. Dennis, who holds the unique position of service engineer of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, spoke on her work. Miss Dennis, who is a graduate of Goucher, Columbia and Cornell, says that the use of a needle was acquired by painful effort, but she did not need to be taught how to drive a nail, and as for screws and screwdrivers, saws and chisels, she took to them as naturally as a duck takes to water, and now that she has reached the age of emancipation, does not pretend to own a thimble. Her work with the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad is a pioneer job, unhampered by red tape and precedent. Mrs. Florence Day was the hostess for the afternoon.

The next evening an enjoyable card party was given at headquarters, with Mrs. Vera Fowler Lewis as chairman.

On Tuesday, February 21, a dinner was held at Memorial Church, the chief feature of which was a discussion between Edward Lucas White, the well-known author, and Edith Houghton Hooker, on the good and bad in Democracy. Mr. White was witty, cynical, highly entertaining and vastly amusing, but it was the two women, Mrs. Louis Gutman, who presided so charmingly, and Edith Houghton Hooker, who gave to the audience something to cherish, something to carry away—faith and courage and a broad vision of life.

On Tuesday, February 28, Mrs. Jennie Feddeman poured tea, and Mrs. Louis H. Levin, a member of the School Board of Baltimore, spoke on the public schools.

Mississippi Turns Down Jury Service

REPRESENTATIVE HUGH BARR MILLER of Copiah County introduced in the Mississippi Legislature for the Woman's Party a bill to allow women to serve on juries. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee, but failed to receive a favorable recommendation.

Tea for Zona Gale

THE District of Columbia Branch of the National Woman's Party gave a tea at National Headquarters on March 2 in honor of Zona Gale of Wisconsin, member of the National Council of the Woman's Party, and distinguished author.

Doris Stevens, who has just returned from the Pan-American Conference in Havana, spoke, as well as Miss Gale. Miss Gale was in Washington to speak at the dinner in honor of Oswald Garrison Villard and the *Nation*, which occurred on March 1.

Two Million Dollar Fund

Treasurer's Report

EMMA WOLD, Treasurer

NETTIE TRAIL, C. P. A., Auditor

RECEIPTS collected by National Headquarters, December 7, 1912, to February 16, 1928, \$1,436,565.47.

Contributions, membership and other receipts, February 16, 1928, to March 1, 1928:

Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.	\$5,000.00
Miss Sheldon Jackson, D. C.	10.00
Mrs. Herman E. Gasch, D. C.	5.00
Mrs. Lucy Cooper Shaw, D. C.	2.50
Miss Joy L. Webster, D. C.	25.00
Miss Gertrude Crocker, Va.	25.00
Mrs. Agnes T. Wilbur, Mass.	1.00
Per District of Columbia Branch:	
(D. C. Branch retaining its quota)	
Miss Mary C. Brown	.25
Miss Ellen Burden	.25
Miss Florence Butler	1.25
Mrs. Augusta Carl	.25
Anna G. Carr	.50
Edith Cornelson	.25
Mrs. Alice Cost	.25
Margaret Crowell	.50
Mrs. E. W. Davidson	.25
Gussie A. Douglas	.25
Mertie Farquhar	.25
Miss Alice Fassig	.25
Miss Mattie Gibson	.25
Miss Clare Greacen	.25
Mrs. Karl W. Greene	.50
Mrs. Alice Heilmuller	.25
Miss Florence Heutlich	.25
Miss Eva Jackson	1.00
Miss Lillie Keathley	.75
Miss Jeannette Kelly	.25
Miss Mabel E. Law	.25
Miss Loyetta Lee	.50
Mrs. W. B. Lew	.25
Mrs. Gertrude Lyons	.25
Mrs. M. A. McAdoo	1.00
Miss M. McMorris	.25
Mrs. Emma March	.25
Mrs. Aida Mayo	.25
Julia Brown Mattingly	.25
Miss Katherine E. Miller	.25
Miss Emma F. Mulloy	.75
Miss Sara J. Patterson	.50
Mrs. Ada Payne	.25
Miss Florence Roach	1.25
Miss Emily Sleman	1.25
Miss Adele V. Smith	.25
Mrs. Florence Smith	.75
Miss Aline Solomons	.25
Miss E. von Seyfried	.50
Mrs. John C. Welch	.50
Mrs. Ida Whittington	.25
Mrs. Legare Obeare, D. C.	5.00
Miss Elsie R. Shields, Cuba	1.00
Miss Mabel Vernon, Del.	6.00
Club Femenino de Cuba	5.00
Mrs. Mathilda Hall Gardner, D. C.	20.00
Senora Pilar Jorge de Tella, Cuba	5.00
Senora Maria Montalvo de Soto Navarro, Cuba	5.00
Federacion de Asociaciones Femeninas de Cuba	5.00
Union de Temperancia	5.00
Miss Lelia Smith, Mass.	1.00
Plintha Wos y Gil, Cuba	6.00
Per New York City Committee:	
(N. Y. C. Committee retaining one-half)	
Madame Alice Baroni	5.00
Mrs. Clarence M. Smith	5.00
Mrs. Randolph Hearst	5.00
Mrs. C. A. Tooker	5.00
Mrs. Calvin Tomkins	5.00
Mrs. Edwin P. Campbell	5.00
Mrs. Lina P. Derektor	5.00
Mrs. Robert Adamson	5.00
Dr. Maude Glasgow	.50
Miss Gertrude Berg	.50
Mrs. Manuel DaCosta	.50
Mrs. Rose Sherwood	.50
Mrs. H. B. Sorries	.50
Miss Tielman	.50
Mrs. W. Van Norden	.50
Miss Edith Outhitt	.50
Miss May Weisser	.50
Miss M. Angonne	.50
Mrs. S. Batkin	.50
Mrs. Bennett	.50
Mrs. Boyle	.50
Miss C. Eberle	.50
Mrs. Kane	.50
Miss A. Luger	.50
Miss S. Miller	.50
Mrs. N. Nintzel	.50
Miss J. Pearsoll	.50
Miss Rogers	.50
Mrs. Ryder	.50
Mrs. C. Saxton	.50
Miss M. Shea	.50
Miss J. Silverstein	.50
Mrs. Sinclair	.50
Mrs. A. Stanford	.50
Mrs. B. Stender	.50
Mrs. A. Stone	.50
Miss Isabel Strachan	.50
Miss C. Edelman	.50
Miss M. Fallon	.50
Mrs. M. A. Frey	.50
Mrs. M. Ganey	.50

Miss F. A. Holland	.50
Miss C. M. Hunt	.50
Mrs. Lambertson	.50
Miss M. Laney	.50
Miss E. Lanzer	.50
Miss C. Murtha	.50
Mrs. M. Schmitz	.50
Miss K. Sullivan	.50
Mrs. F. Van Riper	.50
Miss D. M. Varley	.50
Miss Young	.50
Miss Belle Balsamor	.50
Miss M. Baron	.50
Miss Bartel	.50
Miss A. Beach	.50
Mrs. M. Bolton	.50
Miss A. Byrne	.50
Miss F. N. Dreychick	.50
Miss A. Duffy	.50
Miss Farley	.50
Miss F. Hacker	.50
Mrs. M. Hellenbeck	.50
Mrs. E. Keefe	.50
Mrs. C. Kennedy	.50
Mrs. M. Kennedy	.50
Miss C. Kerwin	.50
Miss A. B. Lynch	.50
Mrs. S. Lynch	.50
Miss E. McLaughlin	.50
Mrs. McLoughlin	.50
Mrs. G. McGovern	.50
Miss A. Marks	.50
Mrs. T. Murray	.50
Miss M. S. Murray	.50
Miss M. O'Connor	.50
Mrs. Orris	.50
Miss A. Bermer	.50
Miss M. A. Conlan	.50
Miss L. Cromwell	.50
Mrs. M. Cronin	.50
Mrs. Anna DeKay	.50
Miss S. Dreitlin	.50
Miss Gladwich	.50
Miss S. Grumpel	.50
Miss M. M. Healy	.50
Mrs. N. Hellenbeck	.50
Mrs. Lois R. Hughes	.50
Miss B. Hunt	.50
Miss M. Karan	.50
Miss M. Lavelle	.50
Mrs. A. Shelling	.50
Mrs. E. Skeath	.50
Miss Helen Sullivan	.50
Miss M. G. Torrey	.50
Miss K. Amass	.50
Mrs. Canfield	.50
Mrs. W. J. Carroll	.50
Miss Chamberlain	.50
Miss K. Clements	.50
Mrs. Corrigan	.50
Mrs. D. Cowan	.50
Mrs. Cox	.50
Miss M. M. Creed	.50
Mrs. F. DeBevoise	.50
Mrs. DeKamp	.50
Mrs. I. Diamond	.50
Mrs. M. Dix	.50
Miss J. Donnelly	.50
Miss M. Dubigg	.50
Mrs. E. K. Dunn	.50
Mrs. Dunning	.50
Miss E. Edwards	.50
Mrs. T. Feldheim	.50
Miss Helen Foley	.50
Miss M. V. Foley	.50
Miss Gillan	.50
Mrs. A. Good	.50
Mrs. M. Hamilton	.50
Miss L. Hanners	.50
Mrs. E. Harkness	.50
Mrs. Grace Kavanaugh	.50
Mrs. E. Kelly	.50
Mrs. M. Kenath	.50
Mrs. L. W. Korwan	.50
Mrs. M. LeBass	.50
Miss C. Lee	.50
Miss B. McCaffery	.50
Miss B. McGloin	.50
Mrs. Montague	.50
Mrs. Lillian Morton	.50
Mrs. Mary A. Murray	.50
Mrs. M. Quinn	.50
Miss A. Reilly	.50
Miss M. Reilly	.50
Miss A. M. Roberts	.50
Mrs. K. Sullivan	.50
Mrs. E. C. Williams	.50
Miss Marion May, N. Y.	100.00
Mrs. H. O. Havemeyer, N. Y.	100.00
Mrs. Isaac H. Dixon, Md.	54.00
Miss Gall Laughlin, Maine	25.00
Mrs. M. L. R. Movius, N. Y.	23.00
Mrs. Georgiana Talbot, Mass.	1.00
Miss A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.	1.00
Burnita Shelton Matthews, Miss.	.75
Mrs. Catherine Shields, Cuba	5.00
Mrs. Richard Wainwright, D. C.	10.00
Madame Diego de Gomez-Quintana, Spain	100.00
Miss Margaret Whittemore, Cal.	25.50
Mrs. Grace F. Leggett, Italy	10.00
Miss Frances Jenkins, Ohio	1.00
Mrs. Elizabeth T. Kent, Cal.	100.00
Miss Lavinia Dock, Pa.	5.00
Mrs. Fred E. Sutton, Mo.	50.00
Cash collection, Susan B. Anthony meeting, February 15, 1928	25.45
Proceeds of luncheon, February 25, 1928	24.10
Refunds	3.84
Dividend endowment fund	6.00
EQUAL RIGHTS subscriptions (forwarded to EQUAL RIGHTS office)	3.50
Rent of rooms at Headquarters	245.00

Total receipts, February 16 to March 1, 1928

\$6,176.74

Total receipts, December 7, 1912, to March 1, 1928

\$1,442,742.21

DAY PRINTING COMPANY

Printers

LIGHT AND LOMBARD STREETS
BALTIMORE, MD.